

MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)
MJacobs@mofo.com
ARTURO J. GONZÁLEZ (CA SBN 121490)
AGonzalez@mofo.com
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Tel.: 415.268.7000/Fax: 415.268.7522

KAREN L. DUNN (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
kdunn@bsflp.com
HAMISH P.M. HUME (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
hhume@bsflp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
1401 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel.: 202.237.2727/Fax: 202.237.6131

WILLIAM C. CARMODY (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
bcarmody@SusmanGodfrey.com
SHAWN J. RABIN (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
srabin@SusmanGodfrey.com
SUSMAN GODFREY LLP
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, New York 10019
Tel: 212.336.8330/Fax: 212.336.8340

Counsel for Defendants
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
and OTTOMOTTO LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

WAYMO LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**DEFENDANTS UBER
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S AND
OTTOMOTTO LLC'S MOTION TO
EXCLUDE ONE OF THREE
OPINIONS PROFFERED BY
WAYMO EXPERT JIM TIMMINS**

Judge: Hon. William H. Alsup
Trial Date: October 10, 2017

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

BACKGROUND

[REDACTED]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Mr. Timmins concludes that:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

ARGUMENT

I. The Opinion at Issue Constitutes Impermissible Legal Conclusions.

The Ninth Circuit has made clear that “expert testimony is not proper for issues of law.” *Crow Tribe of Indians v. Racicot*, 87 F.3d 1039, 1045 (9th Cir. 1996). An “expert witness cannot give an opinion as to her *legal conclusion*, i.e., an opinion on an ultimate issue of law.” *Mukhtar*, 319 F.3d at 1066 n.10 (emphasis in original); *see also Aguilar v. Int’l Longshoremen’s Union*

1 *Local No. 10*, 966 F.2d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 1992) (“matters of law” are “for the court’s
2 determination” and are “inappropriate subjects for expert testimony”); *Pokorny v. Quixtar Inc.*,
3 2007 WL 1932922 at *2 (N.D. Cal. June 29, 2007) (“The prohibition against experts offering
4 legal conclusions is clear[.]”) (citations omitted).

5 Yet expert testimony regarding legal conclusions is precisely what Timmins offers. For
6 example, he opines on:

7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]

16 There can be no dispute that such conclusions are legal in nature and inappropriate subject of
17 expert testimony. See, e.g., *In re Downey Reg’l Med. Ctr.-Hosp., Inc.*, 441 B.R. 120, 129 (9th
18 Cir. 2010) (proposed expert testimony was inappropriate because it involved interpretation of
19 contract); *McHugh v. United Serv. Auto. Ass’n*, 164 F.3d 451, 454 (9th Cir.1999) (expert
20 testimony “cannot be used to provide legal meaning or interpret” contracts).

21 [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED]
25 [REDACTED]
26 [REDACTED]
27 [REDACTED]
28 [REDACTED]

For this reason alone, Timmins' opinion should be excluded.

II. Timmins is Not Qualified to Offer the Contested Opinion

An expert may testify only to matters about which "the witness is qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education." Fed. R. Evid. 702. Timmins' entire opinion is premised on the notion that [REDACTED]. But Timmins does not even purport to have knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education about [REDACTED]. He is not even an attorney. For example, his "General Qualifications" state that he has experience with:

business damages, business valuation, management, director, and partner compensation and equity incentives, fairness, fiduciary duty, intellectual property valuation, legal malpractice, lost profits, reasonable royalty, transfer pricing, investment banking practice and analysis of merger and acquisition (M&A) transactions, venture capital and private equity practice and analysis of investment transactions, and similar matters.

Ex. 1 at App. A. [REDACTED]

Thus, even if the opinion at issue were appropriately offered by an expert (which it is not), it certainly is not appropriately offered by *this* expert.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Uber respectfully requests that the Court exclude the above-described opinion of Jim Timmins as inappropriate and unreliable under the Federal Rules of Evidence and *Daubert*.

1 Dated: September 16, 2017

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP

2
3 By: /s/ Karen L. Dunn
Karen L. Dunn

4 *Counsel for Defendants*
5 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND
6 OTTOMOTTO LLC
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28